

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant acknowledges receipt of the Office Action dated May 4, 2004. Applicant would further like to thank Examiner Swiatek for his courtesy in granting an interview to discuss this case. Claims 1-4, 7-9, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vincent. Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vincent in view of Florance. Claims 10-14 have been objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were determined by the Examiner to contain allowable subject matter. Claim 17 has been allowed. Claims 1-2 and 9-10 have been amended in response to the Office action. Reconsideration and further examination of claims 1-16 is respectfully requested. Amendments to the disclosure have also been made, as required by the Examiner.

During the interview of July 28, 2004, Examiner Swiatek agreed to withdraw the rejection of Claim 2, and indicated that rewriting Claim 2 in independent format would render the claim allowable. This has been done in the current response. Similarly, Claim 10, objected to in the Office Action, has been rewritten in independent format. Accordingly, it is requested that Claims 2 and 10, along with dependent Claims 3-6 and 11-14, be allowed.

Also, during the interview of July 28, 2004, Examiner Swiatek indicated that amendment of Claims 1 and 9 to further define the "means for mounting" would render the claims allowable. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite that the "mounting means [is] connected with one of a lower portion of a side wall of said housing and a bottom of said housing."

The Examiner acknowledged at the interview that trough W was misidentified in the Office Action as trough G due to a typographical error.

It is submitted that claims 7-8 and 15-16 are allowable because they further depend from and limit their independent claims, which are allowable over the cited art references based upon the above arguments.

While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Application No: 10/727,593
Attorney's Docket No: REW 3001.01

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.



Arlir M. Amado
Registration No. 51,399

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
Crystal Plaza One
2001 Jefferson Davis Highway
Suite 1101
Arlington, VA 22202

Date: August 4, 2004